# Frankenstein 1AC Emory

## Quote

#### I had admired the perfect forms of my cottagers—their grace, beauty, and delicate complexions; but how was I terrified when I viewed myself in a transparent pool! At first I started back, unable to believe that it was indeed I who was reflected in the mirror; and when I became fully convinced that I was in reality the monster that I am, I was filled with the bitterest sensations of despondence and mortification. Alas! I did not yet entirely know the fatal effects of this miserable deformity. [[1]](#footnote-1)

## Step 1 Arm Yourselves

#### We live in a culture of normalized violence. Guns, tools we make for our own “protection” are methods of exclusion and perpetuate oppression, Giroux [[2]](#footnote-2)15,

Nine people were killed and seven wounded recently in a mass shooting at a community college in Roseburg, Oregon. Such **shootings** are more than another tragic expression of unchecked violence in the United States; they **are symptomatic of a society engulfed in fear, militarism, a survival-of-the-fittest ethos and a growing disdain for human life.** Sadly, this shooting is not an isolated incident. Over 270 mass shootings have taken place in the United States this year alone, proving once again that **the** economic, political and social **conditions that underlie such violence are not being addressed**. To read more articles by Henry A. Giroux and other authors in the Public Intellectual Project, click [here](http://truth-out.org/public-intellectual-project" \t "_blank). In the United States, calls for liberal, Band-Aid reforms do not work in the face of the carnage taking place. "The United States sees an average of 92 gun deaths per day - and **more preschoolers are shot** dead each year **than police officers** are killed in the line of duty." [(1)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/33127-murder-incorporated-guns-and-the-growing-culture-of-violence-in-the-us#a1) Mass violence in the United States has to be understood within a larger construction of the totality of the forces that produce it. Focusing merely on the more dramatic shootings misses the extent of the needless violence and murders that are taking place daily. US politicians now attempt to govern the effects of systemic violence while ignoring its underlying causes. State repression, unbridled self-interest, an empty consumerist ethos and **war-like values have** **become** the **organiz[ed]ing principles of [the] US** society, **producing an indifference to the common good, compassion, a concern for others and equality.** As the public collapses into the individualized values of a banal consumer culture and the lure of private obsessions, US society flirts with forms of irrationality that are at the heart of everyday aggression and the withering of public life. US society is driven by unrestrained market values in which economic actions and financial exchanges are divorced from social costs, further undermining any sense of social responsibility. In addition, a wasteful, giant military-industrial-surveillance complex fueled by the war on terror, along with the United States' **endless consumption of violence as entertainment and** its **celebration of a** pervasive **gun culture, normalizes the everyday violence waged against** Black youth, immigrants, children fed into the school-to-prison pipeline and **others considered disposable.** US politicians now attempt to govern the effects of systemic violence while ignoring its underlying causes. Under such circumstances, a society saturated in violence gains credence when its political leaders have given up on the notion of the common good, social justice and equality, all of which appear to have become relics of history in the United States. In the face of mass shootings, the public relations disimagination machine goes into overdrive claiming that guns are not the problem, and that the causes of such violence can be largely attributed to people living with mentally illness. When in actuality, as two Vanderbilt University researchers, Dr. Jonathan Metzl and Kenneth T. MacLeish, publishing in the American Journal of Public Health, observed that: Fewer than 6 percent of the 120,000 gun-related killings in the United States between 2001 and 2010 were perpetrated by people diagnosed with mental illness. Our research finds that across the board, the mentally ill are 60 to 120 percent more likely than the average person to be the victims of violent crime rather than the perpetrators.... There are 32,000 gun deaths in the United States on average every year, and people are far more likely to be shot by relatives, friends or acquaintances than they are by lone violent psychopaths. [(2)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/33127-murder-incorporated-guns-and-the-growing-culture-of-violence-in-the-us#a2) It may not be an exaggeration to claim that the US government has blood on its hands because of the refusal of Congress to rein in a gun lobby that produces a growing militarism that sanctions a love affair with the unbridled corporate institutions, financial interests and mass-produced cultures of violence. The Oregon community college shooting is the 41st school shooting this year while there have been 142 incidents of violence on school properties since 2012. Yet, the violence continues unchecked, all the while legitimated by the cowardly acts of politicians who refuse to enact legislation to curb the proliferation of guns or support measures as elementary as background checks - which 88 percent of the American people support - or for that matter, ban large-capacity ammunition magazines and assault rifles. In part, this cowardly refusal on the part of politicians is due to the fact that gun lobbyists pour huge amounts of money into the campaigns of politicians who support their interests. For example, in 2015, the gun lobby spent $5,697,429 while those supporting gun control paid out $867,601. In a New York Times op-ed, Gabrielle Giffords pointed out that the National Rifle Association (NRA) in the 2012 election cycle "spent around $25 million on contributions, lobbying and outside spending."[(3)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/33127-murder-incorporated-guns-and-the-growing-culture-of-violence-in-the-us#a3) Outside money does more than corrupt politics; it is also responsible for people being shot and killed. The culture of violence cannot be abstracted from the business of violence. Many **Americans are obsessed with violence [and]. They** not only own nearly 300 million firearms, but also **have a love affair with powerful weaponry** such as 9mm Glock semiautomatic pistols and AR-15 assault rifles. Collective anger, frustration, fear and resentment increasingly characterize a society in which people are out of work, young people cannot imagine a decent future, everyday behaviors are criminalized, inequality in wealth and income are soaring and the police are viewed as occupying armies. This is not only **a recipe for** both **random violence and mass shootings; it makes such** acts **appear** **routine** and commonplace. **Fear has become a** public relations **strategy used** not only **by the** national security state but also by the **gun industry**. When you live in a country in which you are constantly bombarded by the assumption that the government is the enemy of democracy and you are told that nobody can be trusted, and **the discourse of hate,** particularly **against** Black youth, immigrants and **gun control advocates**, spews out daily from thousands of conservative radio stations and major TV networks, a climate of fear engulfs the country **reinforc[es]ing the belief that gun ownership is the only notion of safety** in which people can believe in order to live as free human beings. Under such circumstances, genuine fears and concerns for safety are undermined. These include the fear of poverty, lack of meaningful employment, the absence of decent health care, poor schools, police violence and the militarization of society, all of which further legitimate and fuel the machinery of insecurity, violence and death. Fear degenerates into willful ignorance while any semblance of rationality is erased, especially around the logic of gun control. As Adam Gopnik observes: Gun control ends gun violence as surely an antibiotics end bacterial infections, as surely as vaccines end childhood measles - not perfectly and in every case, but overwhelmingly and everywhere that it's been taken seriously and tried at length. These lives can be saved. Kids continue to die en masse because one political party won't allow that to change, and the party won't allow it to change because of the irrational and often paranoid fixations that make the massacre of students and children an acceptable cost of fetishizing guns. [(4)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/33127-murder-incorporated-guns-and-the-growing-culture-of-violence-in-the-us#a4) President Obama is right in stating that **the violence we see** in the United States **is** "a political choice we make that allows this to happen." While taking aim at the gun lobby, especially the NRA, what Obama fails to address is that extreme violence is systemic in US society, **has become the foundation of politics** and must be understood within a broader historical, economic, cultural and political context. To be precise, politics has become an extension of violence driven by a culture of fear, cruelty and hatred legitimated by the politicians bought and sold by the gun lobby and other related militaristic interests. Moreover, violence is now treated as a sport, a pleasure-producing form of commerce, a source of major profits for the defense industries and a corrosive influence upon US democracy. And as such it is an expression of a deeper political and ethical corruption in US society. As Rich Broderick insists, US society "embraces a soulless free-market idolatry in which the value of everything, including human beings, is determined by the bottom line" and in doing so this market fundamentalism and its theater of cruelty and greed perpetuate a spectacle of violence fed by an echo chamber "of paranoia, racism, and apocalyptic fantasies rampant in the gun culture." [(5)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/33127-murder-incorporated-guns-and-the-growing-culture-of-violence-in-the-us#a5) The lesson here is that the culture of violence cannot be abstracted from the business of violence. Murdering children in schools, the streets, in jails, detention centers and other places increasingly deemed unsafe has become something of a national pastime. One wonders how many innocent children have to die in the United States before it becomes clear that **the revenue made by the** $13.5 billion **gun industry**, with a $1.5 billion profit, are **fuel[s]**ing **a national bloodbath** by using lobbyists to pay off politicians, wage a mammoth propaganda campaign and induct young children into the culture of violence. [(6)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/33127-murder-incorporated-guns-and-the-growing-culture-of-violence-in-the-us#a6) What is clear is that as more guns are on the streets and in the hands of people a savage killing machine is unleashed on those who are largely poor, Black and vulnerable. **The widespread availability of guns is the reason for** the shooting and **killing[s]** of children and adults in Chicago, Boston, Ferguson, New York City and in other major cities. The Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence reports that "in 2010, guns took the lives of 31,076 Americans in homicides, suicides and unintentional shootings. This is the equivalent of more than 85 deaths each day and more than three deaths each hour. [In addition], 73,505 Americans were treated in hospital emergency departments for non-fatal gunshot wounds in 2010." [(7)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/33127-murder-incorporated-guns-and-the-growing-culture-of-violence-in-the-us#a7) And the toll of gun violence on young people is truly heartbreaking with almost 30,000 young people killed in a 10-year period, which amounts "to nearly 3,000 kids shot to death in a typical year."[(8)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/33127-murder-incorporated-guns-and-the-growing-culture-of-violence-in-the-us#a8) According to a Carnegie-Knight News21 program investigation, For every US soldier killed in Afghanistan during 11 years of war, at least 13 children were shot and killed in the United States. More than 450 kids didn't make it to kindergarten. Another 2,700 or more were killed by a firearm before they could sit behind the wheel of a car. Every day, on average, seven children were shot dead. A News21 investigation of child and youth deaths in the United States between 2002 and 2012 found that at least 28,000 children and teens 19-years-old and younger were killed with guns. Teenagers between the ages of 15 and 19 made up over two-thirds of all youth gun deaths in the United States. [(9)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/33127-murder-incorporated-guns-and-the-growing-culture-of-violence-in-the-us#a9) Even worse, the firearms industry is pouring millions into recruiting and educational campaigns designed to both expose children to guns at an early age and to recruit them as lifelong gun enthusiasts. Reporting on such efforts for The New York Times, Mike McIntire writes: **The industry's** strategies include giving firearms, ammunition and cash to youth groups; weakening state restrictions on hunting by young children; marketing an affordable military-style rifle for "junior shooters" and **sponsor[es]ing** semiautomatic**-handgun[s] competitions** for youths; and **developing** a target-**shooting video game[s]** that promotes brand-name weapons, with links to the Web sites of their makers.... Newer initiatives by other organizations go further, **seeking to introduce children to** high-powered rifles and **handguns** while invoking the same rationale of those older, more traditional programs: that firearms can teach "life skills" like responsibility, ethics and citizenship. [(10)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/33127-murder-incorporated-guns-and-the-growing-culture-of-violence-in-the-us#a10) As the United States moves from a welfare state to a warfare state, state violence becomes normalized. The United States' moral compass and its highest democratic ideals have begun to wither, and the institutions that were once designed to help people now serve to largely suppress them. Gun laws, social responsibility and a government responsive to its people matter. We must end the dominance of gun lobbyists, the reign of money-controlled politics, the proliferation of high levels of violence in popular culture and the ongoing militarization of US society. At the same time, it is crucial, as many in the movement for Black lives have stated, that we refuse to endorse the kind of gun control that criminalizes young people of color. Gun violence in the United States is inextricably tied to economic violence as when hedge fund managers invest heavily in companies that make high-powered automatic rifles, 44-40 Colt revolvers, laser scopes for semiautomatic handguns and expanded magazine clips. [(11)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/33127-murder-incorporated-guns-and-the-growing-culture-of-violence-in-the-us#a11) The same mentality that trades in profits at the expense of human life gives the United States the shameful title of being the world's largest arms exporter. According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, "Washington sold 31% of all global imports during the 2010-2014 period."[(12)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/33127-murder-incorporated-guns-and-the-growing-culture-of-violence-in-the-us#a12) This epidemic of violence connects the spreading of violence abroad with the violence waged at home. It also points to the violence reproduced by politicians who would rather support the military-industrial-gun complex and arms industries than address the most basic needs and social problems faced by Americans. **Rather than arming people** with more guns, criminalizing every aspect of social behavior, militarizing the police and allowing the gun lobby to sanction putting semiautomatic weapons in the hands of children and adults, **the most immediate action** that can be taken **is to institute effective gun control** laws. As Bernardine Dohrn has argued: We want gun control that **sanction**s **manufacturers, distributors and** adults who place, and profit from, **deadly weapons** in the possession of youth. We want military-style weaponry banned. We want smaller schools with nurses and social workers, librarians and parent volunteers - all of which are shown to contribute to less disruption and less violence. Let's promote gun-control provisions and regulations that enhance teaching and learning as well as justice and safety for children, not those that will further incarcerate, punish and demonize young people of color. We've been there before. [(13)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/33127-murder-incorporated-guns-and-the-growing-culture-of-violence-in-the-us#a13) And Dohrn's suggestions would be only the beginning of real reform, one that goes right to the heart of eliminating the violence at the core of US society. The United States has become a society that is indifferent to the welfare of its citizens, as the drive for profits has replaced any vestige of social and moral responsibility. Violence has arisen from the breakdown of public space, the erasure of public goods and a growing disdain for the common good. Gratuitous violence is no longer merely a sport or form of entertainment; it has become central to a society that trades on fear and fetishizes hyperviolent and punitive practices and social relations. Brutal, masculine authority now rules US society and wages a war against women's reproductive rights, civil liberties, poor Black and Brown youth and Mexican immigrants. **When violence becomes an organizing principle [and]** of society, the fabric of a **democracy begins to unravel**, suggesting that the United States is at war with itself. When politicians refuse out of narrow self and financial interests to confront the conditions that create such violence, they have blood on their hands.

#### What is relevant however is not just the existence of American gun paranoia but its target. A gun-based fear is always already protective and internally mobilized towards a foreign other. These monsters monopolize our consciousness and make oppression inevitable, Lal [[3]](#footnote-3)08,

Identity is not a stable and stationary concept; it is constantly redefined and reconstructed to meet new challenges and adapt to new events. It would be easier to draw a parallel between gender identity and state identity to exemplify this concept. Contrary 9 to mainstream thought, gender identity is socially constructed and keeps changing throughout our lives. Comparably, the identity of the state is also in a constant state of flux. The state and its elites are involved in identity work when they place or take things off the national security agenda. And similarly to gender identity, which requires the presence of difference (masculine and feminine) in order for gender to have any meaning, the state requires the existence of the Other to build an identity for the self. This identity is a performative constitution, taking the shape of security discourse, and thus, the “constitution of identity is achieved through the inscription of boundaries that serve to demarcate an ‘inside’ from and ‘outside,’ a ‘self’ from an ‘other,’ a ‘domestic’ from a ‘foreign’ (Campbell 1998, 9). The state moves to eliminate the Other and claim sovereignty over the outside and the foreign. In doing so, the state gains power and control over foreign policy, and international relations becomes a field concerned with building boundaries instead of bridges. However, since the identity of the state is fluid, boundaries do change over time though the performative constitution of state identity, which occurs through security discourse. This positional identity construction will be examined in terms of the Cold War and Post-Cold War era, but it is important to note that the discourse of fear and danger, in order to construct state identity, is not new to the modern nation-state. David Campbell (1998, 49), Professor of International Politics at University of Newcastle in England, suggests in Writing Security that the discourse of danger by the state is as old as Christendom for “thinking that Western civilization was besieged by a horde of enemies (Turks, Jews, heretics, witches), the church saw the devil everywhere and encouraged guilt to such an extent that a culture of anxiety ensured.” Today, Turks, Jews, heretics 10 and witches have simply been replaced with rogue nations, “Arab terrorists,” communists, and “Third World” dictators through security discourse. After the fall of Christendom, danger has become the new God of Western civilization, and according to Campbell (1998, 48), the discourse of threat construction provides a “new theology of truth…about who and what we are by highlighting who or what ‘we’ are not, and what ‘we’ have to fear.” This demonstrates the inherent unstable nature of security as defined by the national security state, and the never-ending construction of identity through the otherization of difference. Instead of celebrating our different identities and bridging the gaps present in international relations, the national security state has drawn boundaries by constructing an identity in opposition to the Other. The Cold War serves as the classic example of statist identity construction through the creation of the Other, which created more insecurity than security for the entire world. After the fall of Hitler and the Axis powers, the United States emerged as a superpower, along with the Soviet Union, which had been a key ally in the war. Due to the neo-realist obsession with an ordered world operating under the assumption that states exist in an anarchic system, the United States formulated an identity of the self that was opposed to disorder and incivility. Out of the Cold War discourse of the Other came the national security state, which was defined by the National Security Act of 1947 (Der Derian 1992, 76), a measure that Truman regretted signing by the time he left office. This national security state found an enemy in the Soviet Union, and created the Other in order to stabilize the self and guarantee its existence. In NSC-68, the United States admitted that even without the threat of Soviet communism, it would still pursue policies designed to shape the world in a more orderly manner (Campbell 1998, 30-31), probably referring 11 to a more capitalist economic order. The Cold War that ensued between the two superpowers became coded as a struggle between good and evil, civilized and barbaric, freedom-loving and totalitarian. Suddenly, the threat of communism was equated to the ruthless and fascist Nazi regime, and communism was “un-American,” as demonstrated by the oppressive activities of the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC). The search for national security created insecurity for a large number of Americans who were labeled as communists and Soviet-sympathizers, blacklisted and lost their jobs. The identity construction by the American statecraft in opposition to Soviet communism did serve the interests of the elite. Issues such as employment, childcare, women’s rights, universal healthcare, and equal wages were characterized as evil and foreign by being associated with communism and the Soviet Union (Campbell 1998, 140). These domestic issues caused vast human insecurity in the United States, and the Cold War search for security caused insecurity throughout the entire world. It is important to note that the Soviet Union was never a military threat to the United States. This is not to say that the USSR lacked military capability, but that its ability to cause severe damage to the United States was not recognized (and encouraged) until it was construed as the Other. To secure the self from the threat of the Other, the two superpowers engaged in a massive arms buildup, which almost resulted in nuclear annihilation during the Cuban Missile Crisis. Furthermore, they fought proxy wars in underdeveloped countries, destroying millions of lives and infrastructure. **The end result of this face-off was a vast amount of human insecurity, the proliferation of w**eapons of **m**ass **d**estruction **and our existing bipolar mindset of the world**. Even today, what constitutes of American is unclear; however, what unites Americans is the threat of what 12 is defined as “un-American” by the national security apparatus. In the Post-September 11 era, identity construction by the American state in terms of us vs. them discourse continues to pervade our consciousness. The threat of a nuclear winter never did materialize, but it seems to have deep frozen the minds of our policymakers, and no amount of thawing makes any difference. George W. Bush is so infected with the “Cold War of the mind” that he keeps coughing up redundant phrases like “they hate freedom,” and “either you are with us or you are with the terrorists," which usually happens every time he stumbles and cannot find anything else in his frozen brain. In a press release after the ‘terrorist’ attack in Bali, Bush stated that “those of us who love freedom must work together to do everything we can to disrupt, deny and bring to justice these people who have no soul, no conscience, people that hate freedom” (U.S. Department of State 2002, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs). Who in their right mind hates freedom?! Then, in his State of the Union address this year, Bush maintained that “the United States has no right, no desire, and no intention to impose our form of government on anyone else. That is one of the main differences between us and our enemies” (U.S. Department of State 2005, Democracy). In all of these cases, the enemy is ill-defined and unknown, simply functioning as an opposition against whom the American state can construct an identity. Additionally, the enemy or the Other is outside the border, and not within, as is represented by “we have to face terrorists abroad so we do not have to fight them here at home.” It is preposterous to think that Americans cannot be terrorists or engage in terrorism, and yet the state ensures us that “we” are peace-loving, free and civil while “they” are constructed as uncivilized, soulless, inhumane, barbaric and oppressive. While functioning as identity construction for the state, this 13 discourse of security also legitimizes state violence in favor of elitist interests.

## Step 2 is the Monster Hunt

#### The disabled body becomes society’s “monsters”. Our bodies become the definition of the abhorrent and our beings are totalized as that of evil, Shelly’s Frankenstein provides us with an understanding of disability criminalization through analyzing the Creature’s exclusion from society, Tansbradshaw [[4]](#footnote-4)15,

**Frankenstein is** not just a story of a creature and his creator; it is also **an allegory for** the social model of **disability. Frankenstein’s monster only becomes a monster when he is** continually **rejected [by]** my **society** and his creator. **Like many disabled people**, they **have to prove themselves continually because they are judged on face value. It doesn’t matter if they have a desire to learn, a**m smart or properly trained – **if you don’t** look or **act a certain way access will be denied.** As Percy Shelley, Mary Shelley’s husband said on The Creature, ‘**The circumstances of [Frankenstein’s monster]** his existence **were so monstrous** and uncommon**, that… his original goodness was gradually turned into the fuel of an inextinguishable misanthropy and** revenge.’

#### This exclusion is violent, our beings are constructed for us and constructed against us, we become the non-human entity that only exists in the nightmares of the non-disabled body, ENG[[5]](#footnote-5),

While Siebers’s theory of identity formation explains why the monster is perceived in such a way, an analysis of Siebers’s theory of social construction is necessary to understand the more expansive ways, beyond spurring the hatred of others, in which the monster’s physical features affect its overall role in society. According to Siebers, **the social construction of disabilities centers around the role that rhetoric,** modern images, and descriptions **play[s] in formulating the perception of disabilities** (14).Siebers criticizes popular portrayals of disabilities, claiming that **society replicates disabilities in a** marginalizing and **blaming manner** (15). **The social construction of disabilities forces disabled individuals to be recognized as inferior** in some sort of way**. People that are disabled are perceived as completely different beings and are faced with suffering from constant prejudice** due to the way that disability is depicted throughout society. **Shelly’s monster** implicitly **understands this social construction, and sees himself cast to the lowest strata due to his** physical **differences:** He considers himself “a blot upon the earth from which all men fled.” (Shelly 105).

#### Our characterization as monsters is the root of hierarchies formed against us, the harm is systemic and our analysis of it is key, Knight,

Hirschmann labels the second level of social construction materialization, wherein the misrepresentation of reality produces material effects (2003, 79). At this level, social construction moves from the misrepresentation of reality to the material creation of the social phenomena it describes. As it applies to Frankenstein, **Shelley effectively illustrates how the misrepresentation of reality materializes into a social hierarchy predicated upon** corporeal **difference by detailing the Creature’s miserable fate of psycho-emotional distress,** social exclusion, and economic poverty. Scholar Rosemarie Garland-Thomson labels this hierarchy the “politics of appearance”5 , whereby **the body serves as “the coordinates of a** taxonomical **system that distributes status,** privilege, and material goods **to a hierarchy anchored by visible human physical variation”** (Garland-Thomson 1997, 135). The second level of social construction is particularly salient because it reminds us that the normative goals of Taylor’s politics of recognition are worth pursuing. Although **the demeaning identity of monster is socially constructed, Shelley reminds her readers that social construction materializes into real and** occasionally **detrimental consequences that require** political **intervention.**

#### And this process controls our ability to construct ourselves for ourselves, our identities come from the outside and the only identity we can identify with is the identity of a monster, just as the Creature could only become a monster, JC [[6]](#footnote-6)14,

This allegory goes into everyday society because the question of nature v nurture is still very alive. Think about it. **We get much of our social identity from those on the outside: f**amily, friends, teachers, etc. There is a reason we trust more of what are friends think of us than our parents. Major **social identity sets a**round the age of preschool or kindergarten **from outside our families. Our own views of our own disabilities**, race, religion, sexuality, sex, and so many other things **are formed from inside** ourselves but **[and] influenced** greatly **from the outside** as we mature. For example I went to high school for a people with Non-Verbal Learning Disorder and Asperger’s. For the first time I heard that poor social skills were a symptom of those on the Autism Spectrum. Teachers here would tell us that people with our diagnoses often don’t get sarcasm and can have trouble interacting with others. While it was powerful to finally know and understand this, it did not really drive the message to the students. By the time I had started attending, I had already become accustomed to being bullied. I was considered different in a normal school setting. However, the bullying continued even at this new school. One message that rang true came from the bullying here. **Students were looked upon by how “normal” they were.** Some would even boast about how they didn’t need medication. **The more normal you** appeared and **acted, the more popular you were. Those that didn’t or** couldn’t **meet this** unspoken **standard were susceptible to bullying** or ridicule. **I was treated like a “monster” and my identity become that of “monster” much like** that of the **Frankenstein[s] creature.**

## Step 3 Lock the Monsters in their Cage

#### The Classroom becomes a cage for the monster and a source of monster construction. Education is a realm by which we come to understand embodiment, it is where we are first constructed as monsters. Disabled bodies are treated as excess to be governed merely because of their difference – and excluded rather than engaged, Ervelles [[7]](#footnote-7)2K,

For example, critical theorists of education have begun to describehow **bodies are inscribed by** the **dominant cultural practices** of schools **through** a process that Peter McLaren has called **“**enfleshment**.” To be “**enfleshed**,”** McLaren explains**, is to be marked by discourses that** not only sit on the surface of the fleshbut **are,** on the other hand, **embedded in the flesh such that we learn “a way of being in our bodies**…that is we are taught to think about our bodies and how to experience our bodies.” **One context where students learn to experience their bodies is education,** where students learn the importance of disciplining their bodies so as not to distract from the “mental efforts” of the mind**. In an attempt to control these “**disruptive excesses**” of unruly bodies, schools have** elaborate **practices that support the rigid organization of classroom space** and time, the overriding emphasis on discipline, and the careful monitoring of the curriculum. **So entrenched are these practices that** Ursula Kelly has argued that **“education is the body and education territorializes the body” since “the notion of *mind/ing bodies* bespeaks** most accurately and succinctly **about how the intersection of** knowledge**, power**, anddesire **craft[s] [subjectivity] as the cultural project of schools.”**

#### And knowledge production is political – traditional approaches to education silence the radical pedagogical approaches that subvert dominant sign-systems that marginalize disability – only the pedagogy produced by the 1AC speech act can solve, Ervelles 2K,

Poststructural theorists of education have therefore argued that **because schools are organized so that** both **teachers and students are positioned into rationality, they serve** actively **to** silence discussions **that attend to the psychic and political nature of embodied knowledges, especially when these knowledges relate to a critical understanding** of the workings **of difference. In place of this silencing** Kelly has suggested that **radical pedagogies should provide the opportunities for teachers and students to explore the subjective embodiment of desire as it is mobilized in and through social forms and practices within schools.** Thus, for example, some poststructuralist feminist educators have described teaching itself as an erotic, passionate, and dangerous act- the site of disturbing pleasures**. The collective goal of this pedagogy is to attain** jouissance***-* the pleasure derived from subverting or exploding dominant, repressive meaning-systems that regulate identity formation** as well as from recognizing the ambiguity, precariousness, and un-decidability of meaning-systems themselves.

#### However this space can be a source of liberation. The narratives of the monster can be used to rupture our current epistemic lens, our subversive interventions can eliminate this false evidence used to try us for crimes we didn’t commit, Ervelles 2K,

Once again, even though none of the authors makes any reference to disability in their essays, I would still like to examine the implications of their critiques for the disabled subject. Drawing on the poststructuralist position especially advocated by Kohli, it could be argued that **the disabled body,** notwithstanding its marginal status, **can resist the disciplining discourses of schooling by producing disruptive narratives that will “**blow apart the fictions” that have located it outside the scope of desire**.** Thus, on exploring the transgressive possibilities of this poststructuralist position, it could be argued that **the disabled subject could transform [themselves]** herself **into a subject of desire by deploying subversive interventions** inspired by Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari’s invention of the “Body-without-Organs,” Judith Butler’s theory of “performativity and citationality,” and Donna Haraway’s dreams of “cyborgean entities,” **so as to read alterity inscribed on the body in multiple transgressive ways.** Here**, desire is defined as both autonomous and productive in its own right such that “[desire] is not bolstered by needs, but rather the contrary’ needs are derived from desire: they are counterproducts within the real that desire produces.”** Based on these claims**, this poststructuralist formulation severs the relation between desire and need,** and in doing so, has (re)conceptualized consumption (desire) as the productive force within the social relations of capitalism, such that the social is now reconceptualized as “a scene of desire and enjoyment that is postneed, postclass, postlabor, and postproduction.”

#### And this reconceptualization is key. We need to be able to affirm our existence as disabled instead of becoming monsters. Frankenstein’s creature never experienced happiness before he was sentenced to death, and this cannot happen to the rest of the disabled body, Campbell in 03[[8]](#footnote-8),

**Our discussion engages the imagination by playing** dangerously(yet cautiously) **with maters of ‘disability ‘**desire’, ‘pride’, ‘culture’ and a transgressive aesthetic. It is a vulnerable conversation, a speaking otherwise about ‘disability’. **By adopting the ‘thought of the outside’ (**as expressed by Foucault, 1988, Orig 1966) **and repositioning our gaze it maybe possible to open up ‘spaces’ for** oppositional technologies **of self that posit ‘disability’ as a positive erotic, grounds for subjugated celebratory experiences of ‘disability’.** As Cheryl Wade puts **“what is missing [is].. a true esteeming of the** Cripple **[disabled] body”** (1994: 35). In this sense, Chapter Seven turns a corner in the dissertation by marking out sites of resistance to technologies of ableism.

#### And this space is key. The classroom, our cage, can be a space of resistance. Treat your ballot as a means of reforming this space to be one of inclusion, Ervelles 2K,

The poststructural turn in critical theories of education that defines the purpose of radical pedagogy as constructing transgressive embodied knowledges and **the classroom as a space of** seduction, desire, authority, and **resistance can** actually **hold emancipatory possibilities for the disabled student. After all, the disabled student embodies the “unruly” subject whose physiological excesses are seen as disrupting the disciplined control of schooling.** In fact, **the** actual **existence of special education programs that serve children with a variety of labels** (learning disabled, emotional and behavioral disorders, mild, moderate, and multiply handicapped**) is predicated on the inability of regular schooling to control effectively the disruptive interruptions of these bodies that appear impervious to the rigid demands for conformity** and rationality **in schools.** Described in these terms, **the (dis)abled body can** therefore **be perceived as epitomizing the transgressive body of poststructural discourses.**

#### And don’t let the neg attempt to “school” me within the disciplined control of rules and rules formation. I am the monster, I disrupt, and your rules do not and cannot apply to me. There is no possibility of a unique violation to your T or theory shells.

## Step 4 the Monster Breaks Free

#### My advocacy is that the judge should endorse a symbolic shift away from the disabled “monster.” The role of the judge should be an educator whose job is to challenge dominant ableist mindsets, Beckett in 2013[[9]](#footnote-9),

#### Serious and systemic disability discrimination provides powerful justification for¶ disability-focused anti-oppressive pedagogy (Beckett 2009), but such pedagogy is also¶ critical to the development of a more ‘innovative and aggressive conception of¶ inclusive education’ (Slee 2011, i). If inclusive education is to help build an inclusive¶ society (Armstrong and Barton 2008), then in addition to meaningful inclusion of¶ disabled students within mainstream settings (itself, likely to do much to challenge¶ disability), schools’ teaching and learning strategies must challenge disability as a¶ form of oppression.¶ Proposed here is a form of ‘inclusive pedagogy’, but not as currently understood.¶ Inclusive pedagogy is usually defined in terms of rethinking curricula and teaching¶ practices to include everyone (Florian and Black-Hawkins 2011). This is vital and a¶ prerequisite for the anti-oppressive pedagogy proposed herein: inclusion, in all¶ regards, being ‘a prerequisite of a democratic education’ (Slee 2011, i).¶ The connection between ‘inclusive’ and ‘democratic’ education, although well¶ established, has been reworked by authors in ‘Disability Studies in Education’¶ (Danforth and Gabel 2006). For example, Goodley (2011) calls for dialogue between¶ critical pedagogy and disability politics. To this end, Baglieri and Shapiro (2012),¶ Gabel and Connors (2009) and Ware (2002) suggest incorporating Disability Studies¶ into the curriculum within US schools. Overall, this work implies that strategies¶ encouraging/supporting students to challenge disability as one form of oppression¶ ought to be part of education for all.¶ If non-disabled students are not encouraged to recognize and challenge disability¶ oppression, then as adults they may **reinforce** and legitimize **disabling ideas and practices** (Rieser and Mason 1990). Disabled students need to be supported to¶ recognize and understand the nature of their oppression and acquire skills to resist¶ this (Mason 1990). Arguably, they also need to be included in such initiatives because¶ relationships between disabled people can be marked by oppression (Wendell 1996).¶ We need to view all students as potentially having a ‘foot in both camps’ i.e.¶ ‘oppressed’ and ‘privileged’.

#### And this is the only alternative. We can’t avoid this discussion lest we perpetuate ableism ourselves, the ballot is key, Evans et al in 12,[[10]](#footnote-10)

Lack of community discussion is neither random nor power-neutral. We have tried to have discussions. These discussions have been regularly derailed—in “wrong forum” arguments, in the demand for “evidence,” in the unfair burdens placed on the aggrieved as a pre-requisite for engagement. Read the last ten years of these discussions on edebate archives: Ede Warner on edebate and move forward to Rashad Evans diversity discussion from 2010 to Deven Cooper to Amber Kelsie’s discussion on CEDA Forums and the NDT CEDA Traditions page. We have been talking for over a decade, we have been reaching out for years, we have been listening to the liberal, moderate refrain of “we agree with your goals but not with your method.” We will no longer wait for the community to respond, to relinquish privilege, to engage in authentic discussion, since largely the community seems incapable of producing a consensus for responding to what “we all agree” is blatant structural inequity. It seems that meta-debates/discussions about debate are generally met with denial, hostility and—more often—silence. This silence is in fact a focused silence**.** It is not people in the Resistance Facebook group that comprise these silent figures—it is (as has been described) “the old boys club.” We have been quite vocal—and we believe that it is this very vocalness (and the development of a diversity of tactics in response to status quo stalling tactics) that has provoked response when response was given. Sarah Spring’s cedadebate post is a case in point. The decision to change our speaker point scale is not in order to produce a “judging doomsday apparatus” (this kind of apocalyptic rhetoric might more aptly be applied to the current racist/sexist/classist state of affairs in this community), though we must admit that we are flattered that our efforts have affected the community enough to result in such a hyberbolic labeling. **It** indicates that civil disobedience is still an effective tactic; the debate community should take it as an indication that our calls for change are serious. We will continue to innovate and collaborate on tactics of resistance. This “crisis” in debate has no end in sight. The rationale for changing the point scale was not simply to “reward” people for preferring the unpreferred critic. We recognize that MPJ produces effects, and we hoped that changing our point scale was a small but significant tactic that was available to the disenfranchised in this community. MPJ:

#### And the debate space is inherently biased, our ignorance advantages the privileged while ignoring the marginalized. A change is needed now, ignorance only perpetuates the problem, Sedgwick [[11]](#footnote-11)90,

**Knowledge,** after all, is not itself power, although it **is the magnetic field of power. Ignorance** and opacitycollude or **compete[s] with knowledge in mobilizing the flows of energy, desire, goods, meanings, persons.** If M. Mitterrand knows English but Mr. Reagan lacks—as he did lack - French, it is the urbane M. Mitterrand who must negotiate in an acquired tongue, the ignorant Mr. Reagan who may dilate in his native one. Or **in the interactive speech model** by which, as Sally McConnell-Ginet puts it, **"the standard. . . meaning can be thought of as what is recognizable** solely **on the basis of** interlocutors1 **mutual knowledge of established practices of interpretation,"" it is the interlocutor who has** or pretends to have **the less broadly knowledgeable understanding of interpretive practice who will define the terms of the exchange.** So, for instance, **because** "men, with superior extralinguistic resources and **privileged discourse positions, are** often **less likely to treat perspectives different from their own as** mutually **available for communication," their attitudes are "**thus **more likely to leave a lasting imprint on the common semantic stock** than women's."4

#### And this makes evaluation impossible absent questioning ableist underpinnings, the discourse is always privileged to the non-disabled body, it’s a prior question to the round’s evaluation.

#### And my discussion comes first, we cannot evaluate any other layer of the flow without first evaluating which bodies are excluded from that discussion, Boys in 08[[12]](#footnote-12),

This shifts the inquiry from representations (on the body, in the space) to relationships, processes and contexts. Any encounter is **necessarily** mediated by who is there, who is not, why they are there **(or why not), what they bring to the situation and what they take away.** Such events involve meanings-in-the-making through a process in space and over time. **Importantly** encounters are not just a space of sharing and recognition but also of conflict, differentiation and negotiation. They involve interpretations, talk, gestures, bodily relationships, and actions. **So how do encounters** work? **In each case we now have two questions which allow the exploration of disability beyond being a stereotypical marker of identity or difference. What embodied knowledge and experience do we the participants bring to the encounter? What are the routine social and spatial practices which frame the encounter?** Here, disabled and ‘non-disabled’ participants are not separated out; all have parity in the space of the encounter itself. But the impact of framing disabled people in ways not of their making remains central to the investigation. **As Davis write**s**:** Disability is not so much the lack of a sense or the presence of a physical or mental impairment as it is the reception and construction of that difference.

#### And disability studies must be integrated within any role of the ballot, exclusion of ableism makes solvency impossible, Ervelles[[13]](#footnote-13),

Just as the day presses on impervious to its unpredictability, the field of disability studies also presses on buoyed by a similar capriciousness. It would appear that my own location as alternately "outsider within" (Hill-Collins, 1998) and/or just "outsider" is made possible by the very nature of disability studies. According to Hill-Collins (1998), **"outsider-within" describes "the location of people who no longer belong to any one group"** (5), **as well as the "social locations** or border spaces **occupied by groups of unequal power"** (5). **This** nomadic **existence at the borders produces a tentative non-authoritarian knowledge that is** simultaneously **marginal and perceptive, "embrac[ing] multiplicity yet remain[ing] cognizant of power"** (8). I argue that **similar ambiguities frame the field of disability studies providing** several **manifestos for life at the borderlands. These** manifestos **are replete** not with directives but **with the most radical re-imagining of possibilities. They thrive on the unthinkable of ableist discourses. They** produce few answers but rather **embrace the infuriating practice of constantly troubling the questions. They make even the radical seem** quite **conservative. Take any radical theory—**radical humanism, marxism, post structuralism, critical race theory, feminist theory, queer theory, etc**. Place a disruptive disability studies in its midst. Tentatively pose questions. Trouble their assumptions undergirding their** alternative/radical **conceptions of the normal.** What is autonomy? **When** exactly **is life not worth living? Why does rationality have to be the sole determinant of our humanity?** How do we define limit? **Listen carefully to their answers.**

#### And theory is a refusal to engage with the 1AC, it only feeds the link, McElwain 14[[14]](#footnote-14),

When coaches and educators dismiss literature from other parts of the library for referencing “obscurantist” philosophy, they do a disservice to their students. What does seem to be true to me is that running theory against such criticism can only result in intervention. It’s simple—reading theory is such a tremendous refusal to engage with the substance of the kritik that either the judge is similarly unwilling to engage and will reject the kritik on face or the judge looks to the substance of the kritik and acknowledges that running theory merely feeds the link. I’ve heard many attempts to justify why certain hypothetical pre-fiat arguments would justify running theory, and it’s easy to agree with many of them, but I have never seen such an argument in a real debate round. I have never heard a debater say that they should win for saying racism is bad or that I should drop their opponent because they are male. The actual pre-fiat arguments I hear students make are sophisticated and rely on literature that has great depth and demands engagement and not dismissal. Although an entire other article would have to be written about substantive ways to engage with arguments about race or gender, it goes without saying that the first step is to accept that your opponent is saying something, rather than rejecting their arguments out of hand. Don’t assume what your opponent does is “pre-fiat”, “performance”, or “resistance”, listen, and let them tell you what they are doing. Even if you want to talk about moral philosophy, you should have the conviction to defend the value of philosophical education rather than relying on what amounts to a procedural argument to get out of explicitly defending your values. It should go without saying, but if a model of debate cannot even justify its own educational value, why should it ever win a round?

## Science Fiction

#### Science fiction disrupts stable hierarchies and binaries, Fekete [[15]](#footnote-15)01,

Science fiction commentary today largely presupposes the democratization and decentralization of the modern system of Art, and the revaluation made possible by the loosening of the value hierarchy that had authorized the exalted status of a centralized high Art canon and the correspondingly low status of the popular or commercial literatures and paraliteratures (to which sf has tended to belong). The nuts and bolts discourse on sf nowadays shows little anxiety about the genre’s non-canonical status. The agendas of Science Fiction Studies, the pre-eminent regular home of academic sf scholarship, for example, have shifted during the 1990s, as indeed the journal anticipated at the beginning of that decade (Csicsery-Ronay Jr., "Editorial"). As a result, a variety of deconstructive and counter-canonical readings have increased the theoretical density of the journal and given it a new-left intellectual face that is double-coded, Janus-like, turning both to cultural critique and to a critique of the traditional presuppositions of critique. It is interesting to note a continuing consensus in sf scholarship on advancing the adversarial culture and producing an alternative discourse around creative writing of an alternativist character. At the same time, critiques frequently "post" their own grounding, as happens with other double-codings of postmodern culture, where the basic intellectual categories (certainties) of modernity are called into question and recoded. Feminist and post-feminist, Marxist and post-marxist, modernist and post-modernist, humanist and post-humanist, historicist and post-historicist, gendered and post-gendered analytic and theoretic modes of discourse step by step refashion a dialogic space that begins to appear post-critical. It is probably fair to say that the "posting" of the adversarial culture foreseen in Baudrillard’s hypothesis of the hyperreal reduction of distance between the fictive and the real, in Lyotard’s libidinal aesthetic, and in the assumptions of a number of postmodern antifoundationalists, has not yet been robustly theorized or persuasively disseminated. Nevertheless, the post-critical horizons of science fiction discourse have been announced, even if related agendas are only slowly and cautiously emerging. Into this context arrives Carl Freedman’s Critical Theory and Science Fiction. In a science fiction milieu where dedicated works of theory reflecting on the nature of science fiction itself are relatively rare, such a book is to be welcomed, especially as it makes a real contribution by drawing attention to relationships between critical theory and sf. At the same time, the book has a strong adversarial parti pris that seems emblematic of an earlier time, or perhaps of the more traditional pole of an emerging debate. The book’s twin purposes—to show that science fiction is an intrinsically critical-theoretical generic mode, and to establish canonizing, critical-theoretical readings of five best-of-type sf texts by Stanislaw Lem, Ursula K. Le Guin, Joanna Russ, Samuel R. Delany, and Philip K. Dick—draw a line in the sand. The proposed generic definition and related critical canon will select out much of known science fiction and select in a limited array of texts grounded on historiosophical or philosophical premises that have much in common with the foundations of the selective traditions of elite Literature. The bottom line is that a highly selective generic definition of the kind that Freedman proposes would substantially narrow the legitimate membership of the sf genre and dovetail at least in part with impulses toward the kind of legitimation that is neither in the interests of the wide audiences that appreciate sf for its variety, nor any longer necessary as a strategy for drawing academic attention to sf. On closer scrutiny, indeed, the exclusionary legitimating argument turns out to be working the other side of the street, using the known and demonstrable appeals of sf to legitimate a narrowly critical reading strategy.
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